

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

-----oo0oo-----

ADAM HEGGEN, an individual,

No. 2:21-cv-107 WBS DB

Plaintiff,

v.

HEAVENLY VALLEY, Limited  
Partnership, and DOES 1 THROUGH  
10, inclusive,

ORDER RELATING CASES

Defendants.

ANNA GIBSON and ZACHARIAH SAIZ-  
HAWES on behalf of themselves  
and all those similarly  
situated,

No. 2:21-cv-1260 WBS DB

Plaintiffs,

v.

THE VAIL CORPORATION D/B/A VAIL  
RESORTS MANAGEMENT COMPANY and  
DOES 1 THROUGH 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

1 CHRISTOPHER HAMILTON, as an  
2 individual and on behalf of all  
2 others similarly situated,

No. 2:21-cv-1608 WBS DB

3 Plaintiff,

4 v.

5 HEAVENLY VALLEY, LIMITED  
6 PARTNERSHIP, a Nevada limited  
6 partnership, and DOES 1 through  
7 50, inclusive,

7 Defendants.

8  
9 PAUL GREG ROBERDS, individually  
10 and on behalf of all others  
10 similarly situated,

No. 2:21-cv-2251 TLN CKD

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 THE VAIL CORPORATION WHICH WILL  
14 DO BUSINESS IN CALIFORNIA AS  
14 VAIL RESORTS MANAGEMENT  
15 COMPANY, a Colorado  
15 Corporation; HEAVENLY VALLEY,  
16 LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, a Nevada  
16 Limited Partnership; and DOES  
17 1-50, inclusive, THE VAIL  
17 CORPORATION D/B/A VAIL RESORTS  
18 MANAGEMENT COMPANY and DOES 1  
18 THROUGH 100, inclusive,

19 Defendants.

20  
21 -----oo0oo-----  
22

23 The court previously related cases Heggen v. Heavenly  
24 Valley, Limited Partnership, 2:21-cv-00107 WBS DB; Gibson v. Vail  
25 Corp., No. 2:21-cv-01260 WBS DB, and Hamilton v. Heavenly Valley,  
26 Limited Partnership, 2:21-cv-01608 WBS DB. (Docket No. 9.) The  
27 court now finds that Roberds v. Vail Corporation, 2:21-cv-02251  
28 TLN CKD, is also related within the meaning of Local Rule 123(a),

1 because all four cases contain similar claims brought by  
2 overlapping groups of employees for alleged failures to provide:  
3 (1) all wages for time worked; (2) overtime; (3) meal periods;  
4 (4) rest periods; (5) accurate wage statements; and (6)  
5 reimbursement for necessary business expenses. Accordingly, the  
6 assignment of these matters to the same judge is likely to effect  
7 a substantial saving of judicial effort and is also likely to be  
8 convenient for the parties.

9                 The parties should be aware that relating the cases  
10 under Local Rule 123 merely has the result that all actions are  
11 assigned to the same judge; no consolidation of the actions is  
12 effected. Under the regular practice of this court, related  
13 cases are generally assigned to the judge and magistrate judge to  
14 whom the first filed action was assigned.

15                 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the actions denominated  
16 Heggen v. Heavenly Valley, Limited Partnership, 2:21-cv-00107 WBS  
17 DB; Gibson v. Vail Corp., No. 2:21-cv-01260 WBS DB; Hamilton v.  
18 Heavenly Valley, Limited Partnership, 2:21-cv-01608 WBS DB, and  
19 Roberds v. Vail Corporation, 2:21-cv-02251 TLN CKD be, and the  
20 same hereby are, deemed related. The cases denominated Roberds  
21 v. Vail Corporation, 2:21-cv-02251 TLN CKD, shall be reassigned  
22 to the Honorable WILLIAM B. SHUBB and Magistrate Judge DEBORAH  
23 Barnes. Any dates currently set in the reassigned case only are  
24 hereby VACATED. Henceforth, the captions on documents filed in  
25 the reassigned case shall be shown as Roberds v. Vail  
26 Corporation, 2:21-cv-02251 WBS DB.

27                 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court make  
28 an appropriate adjustment in the assignment of cases to

1 compensate for this reassignment.

2  
3 Dated: April 27, 2022



4 WILLIAM B. SHUBB  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28